

I am deeply concerned about Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force stations they own to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election. As a large broadcast media company, Sinclair has an inordinate share of the market, and is using this to promote one candidate over another. This goes beyond an editorial endorsement or a news program. It is in effect an unreported and unregulated gift to the campaign of one candidate. Sinclair has said that it will allow "equal time," but I believe that this is no more than a rhetorical trap, given the inflammatory content that the "documentary" seems to contain.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. I don't believe that they are serving this interest. Indeed, I think they are subverting this interest.

While this is an individual action on the part of one large company, in the long run Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, and return the control of the public airwaves to the American people.

Thank you